



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 09/841,089 | 04/25/2001 | Donald R. Ryan | A0477-US-NP XERZ 2 01054 | 4959 |
| 27885 | 7590 10/30/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP 1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SEVENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44114 | | | HUNTSING | GER, PETER K |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2625 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Interview Summary | 09/841,089 | RYAN ET AL. | | |
| merview cammary | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | Peter K. Huntsinger | 2625 | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO | personnel): | | | |
| (1) Peter K. Huntsinger. | (3) <u>Kevin Dunn</u> . | | | |
| (2) <u>Kimberly Williams</u> . | (4) | | | |
| Date of Interview: 23 October 2006. | | | | |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2 | 2)∏ applicant's representative | ·] | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: | e)⊠ No. | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> . | | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: Allen et al. Patent 6,54 | 9 <u>,299</u> . | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g |)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N | I/A. | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | nature of what was agreed to | if an agreement was | | |
| (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amend allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached | opy of the amendments that w | | | |
| THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | KAWILL | lana | | |
| | kinderiy wil Supervisory Patei | LIAMS | | |
| Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. | Examiner's sign | ature, if required | | |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney and examiner discussed the rejections to the claims, specifically claim 1. The applicant's attorney argued the prior art reference Allen et al. did not teach the limitation of a production monitor controller that outputs job coordination information, which coordination information is based at least in part upon constraints of the finishing device. The examiner explained the interpretation of how Allen et al. met the limitation. Although a mutual understanding of both the examiner's and the applicant's positions was achieved, no agreement was reached.